(5)
14

A N

Antidote against Poyson:

OR, A N

ANSWER

TO THE

Brief Notes upon the CREED

OF

St. Athanasius;

By an ANONIMOUS AUTHOR.

By *J. SAVAGE*; Gent.

Written for the Information of the Illiterate and Vulgar.

" WHosoever will be saved, be-
" fore all things, 'tis Necessa-
" ry that He hold the Catho-
" lick Faith.

A Good Life is of Absolute Necessity to Salvation; but *a Right Belief* in these Points that have been always controverted in the Churches of God, is in no degree Necessary, much less *Necessary before all things*. He that leads a Profane or Vicious Life, sins against a plain acknowledg'd Rule, and the express unquestion'd Words and *Letter* of the Divine Law, and the Dictates of Natural Conscience; He *wilfully refuses* to advert to these

Monitors, and therefore can no way palliate or excuse his Wickedness. But he that errs in a Question of Faith, after having used *reasonable diligence* to be rightly inform'd, is in no fault at all; *his Error is pure Ignorance.* Not a culpable Ignorance; for how can it be culpable, not to know that, of which a Man is Ignorant, after *a Diligent and Impartial* Inquiry.?

" Which Faith except a Man keep Whole " and Undefiled, without doubt He shall " perish Everlastingly.

By keeping this Faith *Whole and Undefiled* must be meant (if any thing be meant) that a Man should believe and profess it, *without Adding to it*; *or Taking from it.* If we take from it, we do not keep it *Whole*; if we add ought to it, we do not keep it *Undefiled*: and either way we shall perish everlastingly.

First, for *Adding*. What if an Honest plain Man, *because He is a Christian and a Protestant*, shall think it Necessary to add this Article to the Athanasian Creed: " I be- " lieve the Holy Scriptures of the Old and " New Testaments, to be a Divine, Infalli- " ble, and *Compleat Rule*, both for Faith and " Manners? I hope no Protestant would think a Man shall be damned for such Addition: And if so, then this Creed of *Athanasius* is at least *an Unnecessary Rule* of Faith.

Then for *taking ought from* this Creed; the whole Greek Church (diffused through so many Provinces) rejects, *as Heretical*, that Period of it, " The Holy Ghost is of the Fa- " ther, and of the Son: contending that the Holy Spirit is *from the Father only.* Which also they clearly and demonstratively prove, as we shall see in its proper place. And for the Menace here of *Athanasius*, that they shall perish Everlastingly; they laugh at it, and say, *He was drunk when he made this Creed*, Gennad. Schol. A. Bp. of *Constantinople.*

" And the Catholick Faith is this.

Catholick Faith, is as much as to say in plain English, *the Faith of the whole Church.* Now in what Age was this which here follows, the Faith of the whole Church? Not in the Age of *Athanasius* himself; who for this Faith, and for Seditious Practices, was banish'd from *Alexandria* in *Egypt* (where he was Bishop) no less than *Four times*; whereof the first was by *Constantine the Great.* He was also condemned in his own Life-time *by Six Councils*, as an Heretick and Seditious Person: Of these Councils, that at *Milan* consisted of 300 Bishops; and that at *Ariminum* of 550, the greatest Convention of Bishops that ever was. This Consent of the Churches of God against him and his Doctrin, occasioned that Famous Proverb; Athanasius *against all the World, and all the World against* Athanasius.

For the times Before and After, the curious Reader may see *Chr. Sandius* his Ecclesiastical History: in which the Learned Author gives a large Account, by *what* and *whose* means the Athanasian and Trinitarian Faith did at length prevail, against *the Ancient belief* of but One God, or but *One who is God.* Therefore quære, With what Forehead the Author of this Creed, calls this, *the Catholick Faith*, or Faith of the whole Church? when 'tis certain, it has been so in no Age, and least of all in the Author's.

" The Catholick Faith is this, That we " worship one God in Trinity; and Tri- " nity in Unity.

He means here, that we must so worship the one true God, as to remember He is Three Persons; and so worship the Three Persons, as to bear in mind that they are but one Substance, or Godhead, or God. So the Author explains himself in the three next Articles, which are these;

" Neither confounding the Persons, nor " dividing the Substance: for there is one " Person of the Father, another of the Son, " another of the Holy Ghost: but the God- " head of the Father, and of the Son, and of " the Holy Ghost, is all one. Therefore all these Articles make indeed but one Article, which is this; " The one true God is *Three* " *distinct Persons*; and three distinct Persons " (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit) are the " one true God.

Plainly, as if a Man should say, *Peter, James*, and *John*, being *Three Persons*, are *one Man*; and one Man is these Three distinct Persons, *Peter, James*, and *John.* Is it not now a Ridiculous Attempt, as well as a Bar-

a Barbarous Indignity, to go about thus to make Asses of all Mankind, under pretence of teaching them a Creed, and things Divine, to despoil them of their Reason, the Image of God, and the Character of our Nature? But let us, in two words, examine the parts of this Monstrous Proposition, as 'tis laid down in the Creed it self.

" Neither confounding the Persons, nor " dividing the Substance.

But how can we not confound the Persons, that have (they say) but *one numerical Substance*? And how can we but divide the Substance, which we find in three *distinct divided* Persons?

" There is one Person of the Father, ano- " ther of the Son, another of the H. Ghost.

Then the Son is not the Father, nor is the Father the Son, nor the Holy Ghost either of them: I shall not need to prove this Consequence, not only because 'tis evident, but because 'tis acknowledged by the Trinitarians. But if the Father is not the Son, and yet is (by confession of all) *the One true God*; then the Son is not the One true God, because He is not the Father: the reason is self-evident, for How can the Son be the one true God, *if he is not He who is the One true God*? After the same manner it may be proved, that (on the Athanasian Principles) neither the Father nor Holy Spirit are, or can be God, or the One true God; for neither of them is the Son, who is the One true God according to *Athanasius*, and all Trinitarians: for thy all say, the Father is the One true God, the Son is the One true God, and the Holy Ghost is the One true God. Which is a three-fold Contradiction, because there is but One true God, and One of these Persons is not the other. But if it be a Contradiction, 'tis certainly false; for every Contradiction being made up of Inconsistences, destroys it self, and *is its own Confutation*.

" The Godhead of the Father, and of " the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all " One; the Glory equal, the Majesty coe- " ternal.

The meaning of the last Clause is, That the Glory and Majesty of the Son and Holy Spirit, is equal to the Glory and Majesty of the Father; or the Son and Holy Spirit are equally Glorious and Majestical with God the Father.

Therefore I ask, Whether the Glory and Majesty, with which the Son and Spirit are Glorious and Majestical, be *the same in Number* (that is, the very same) with which the Father is Glorious and Majestical; or only *the same for Kind and Degree*? If it be not the same *in Number*, then the Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, is not (as this Creed teaches) *all One*; and they are not one and the same God; for two *Infinite and Distinct Glories*, and *Majesties*, make two Gods, and three make three Gods; as every one sees, and (to say true) the Trinitarians themselves confess. It remains therefore that, they say, the Glory and Majesty of the Son and Spirit, is *the same in Number*, and not for Kind and Degree only, with that of the Father: but then it follows, that the Glory and Majesty of these Persons is *neither Equal nor Coeternal*. Not Equal; for 'tis the same, which Equals never are: nor Coeternal, for this also plainly intimates that they are Distinct; for how Coeternal, if not Distinct? Do we say, a thing is Coeternal or Contemporary with it self? Therefore this Article also doth impugn and destroy it self. Besides, if the Glory and Majesty of the Three Persons be *numerically the same*, then so are all their other Attributes: from whence it follows, that there is not any real Difference between the Three Persons: and they are only *three several Names of God*; which is the Heresie of the Sabellians.

In the next place this Creed teaches, that " The Father is Incomprehensible, " Uncreate, Eternal, Almighty; the Son is " Incomprehensible, Uncreate, Eternal, Al- " mighty; the Holy Spirit is Incomprehen- " sible, Uncreate, Eternal, Almighty: Also " that each of these Persons *by himself* is God " and Lord; so that the Father is God, the " Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; " yet there are not Three Gods or Lords, " nor Three Incomprehensibles, nor Three " Almighties, nor Three Eternals or Un- " created.

Now if in imitation of this, a Man should

have a mind to say; "The Father is a Per-
"son, the Son is a Person, and the Holy
"Ghost is a Person; yet *not three Persons*,
"but one Person. I would know, why this were not as good *Grammar and Arithmetick*; as when *Athanasius* says, the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, yet *not three Gods*, but one God: or when He says, the Father Uncreated, the Son Uncreated, and the Holy Ghost Uncreated, yet *not three Uncreated*, but one Uncreated; and so of the rest?

Doth not a Man contradict himself, when the Term or Terms in his Negation, are the same with those in his Affirmation? If not, then it may be true, that "the Father
"is a Person, the Son is a Person, the Holy
"Ghost is a Person, yet *there are not Three*
"*Persons*, but One Person; For all the fault here is only this, that in the last Clause the term *Person* is *denied* to belong to more than One, when in the first it had been *affirmed* of no fewer than Three. For the same Reason it must be a Contradiction to say, "The
"Father is God, the Son is God and the
"H. Ghost is God, yet *there are not three Gods*,
"but one God; For the Term *God* is at last, *denied* to belong to more than One, though in the first Clause it was *affirmed* of Three, Will they say that in these words, *there are not three Gods, but one God*; the Term *God* is not Denied to belong to more than One, or is not appropriated to One? If so, then *there are not three Persons, but one Person*; and again *There are not three Men, but one Man*; Then, I say, these Propositions do not Deny the Terms *Person* and *Men* to belong to more than One, or appropriate them to One only; which yet every Body confesses they do.

But here is a *Numerical*, or Arithmetical, as well as Grammatical Contradiction. For in saying, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost; yet not Three Gods, but One God; A Man first distinctly, numbers Three Gods; and then in summing them up, *brutishly* says, not Three Gods, but One God.

To these things it will perhaps be answered, that when we say, *God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost*; or thus, *The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God*; the Term *God* is used Essentially, and therefore comprehends the whole Three Persons; so that there is neither *a Grammatical, nor Arithmetical Contradiction*. But this Remedy is worse (if possible) than the Disease; for it owns that there are *Three Personal Gods*, though there is but *one Essential God*; and that otherways the Propositions of which we are speaking, would imply all the aforesaid Contradictions. This Remedy, I say, is worse than the Disease; for, 1. Three Personal Gods, and one Essential God, make Four Gods, if the Essential God be not the same with the Personal Gods; and though He is the same with them, yet since they are not the same with one another, but distinct, it follows that there are Three Gods, that is, Three Personal Gods. 2. It introduces *two sorts of True Gods*, Three Personal, and one Essential. But the Christian Religion knows and owns but one True and most High God, of any sort. And I would know of the Trinitarians, whether they dare say, in express words, *There are two sorts of True Gods*?

"For like as we are *compelled* by the
"Christian Verity, to acknowledge every
"Person *by himself* to be Lord and God, *&c.*

By the Christian Verity I suppose is meant, the Sacred Books which contain the Christian Religion; that is, the Books of the Old and New Testament. But do these Books, and do's this *Verity* compel us to the acknowledgment of three Persons, each of which is *by Himself* Supream God and Lord, and yet all of them together but one God? Doth, I say, the Holy Scripture *compel us* to this contradictory Acknowledgment? Is there any Text alledged from Scripture, which all the Unitarians, and some or other of the most Learned Trinitarians, do not easily interpret in such sense, that the Unity of God is preserved; and no more than one Person (even the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ) acknowledged to be God? See the History of the *Unitarians*. But if there is no Text of Scripture, but what is in the Opinion of some or other of their own Learned Men, fairly capable of a sense contrary to the Faith deliver'd in this Creed;

then

then we are *not compelled* to acknowledg this Faith. And the truth is, the Conteſt between the Unitarians and Trinitarians is not, as is commonly thought, *a Claſh of Reaſon with Scripture*: but it layeth here, Whether, when the Holy Scriptures may be underſtood as teaching only one God, or but One who is God, which agrees with the reſt of Scripture, and with Natural Reaſon; we muſt notwithſtanding, prefer an Interpretation of it that is Abſurd, and contrary to it ſelf, to Reaſon, and to the reſt of Scripture, ſuch as the Trinitarian Interpretation (expreſt in this Creed) appears to be? In a word, the Queſtion only is, Whether we ought to interpret Holy Scripture when it ſpeaks of God, *according to Reaſon*, or not; that is, like Fools, or like Wiſe Men?

" The Son is of the Father alone; not
" Made, nor Created, but Begotten.

Here, and in the next period, *Athanaſius* is got into his Altitudes, or Profundities, which you will. Here 'tis that the Ignorant think, they are taught the Inmoſt Secrets of Theological Knowledge; but *High* and *Low* are not more contrary, than the things which are here affirmed as equal Truths.

If the Creed-maker had ſpoke here of the Generation of the Son by the Divine Power on the Virgin *Mary*, it would have been true that, *the Son is neither Made, nor Created, but Begotten*; but then the firſt part of the Article would be falſe, that *the Son is of the Father alone*; for He that has a Father, and a Mother, is *of Both*. But ſince he ſpeaks of the (pretended) Eternal Generation, the latter part of the Article is falſe, and inconſiſtent with the firſt part of it. Every Novice in Grammar, and proper ſpeaking, knows, that *Begotten*, when 'tis diſtinguiſhed from *Made* and *Created*, always ſuppoſes two Parents, a Mother as well as Father; 'tis therefore a Contradiction to ſay, *the Son is of the Father alone, not Made, nor Created, but Begotten*; for if He is Begotten, He cannot be of the Father alone; and if He is of the Father alone, He is not begotten, but *either Made, or Created.*

" The Holy Ghoſt is of the Father and
" of the Son; neither Made, nor Created,
" nor Begotten, but Proceeding,

The firſt Fault here is, that the Holy Spirit is ſaid to proceed from the Father *and from the Son.* To which Hereſie the Greek Church have ever oppoſed thoſe clear words, John 15. 26. *When the Comforter is come, whom I will ſend unto you* from the Father; *even the Spirit of Truth* which Proceeded from the Father, *He ſhall teſtify of me.*

Secondly, He ſaith here, that the Holy Ghoſt is *not Begotten, but Proceeding*; He adds ſhortly after, that *He who will be ſaved, muſt thus think of the Trinity*; Therefore ſurely *Begotten* and *Proceeding* differ very much, and very clearly; elſe tis an Harſh Sentence, that we ſhall be damned if we do not Conceive, beſides all other unconceivable Myſteries of this Creed, that the Holy Ghoſt is *not Begotten*, but *Proceeds.* Yet after all 'tis now confeſſed by the moſt Learned Trinitarians, that Begotten and Proceeding differ nothing at all; and that it is rightly ſaid, *The Son proceeds from the Father*, and that *the Holy Ghoſt is generated of Both*; directly contrary to this Creed. It follows that *Athanaſius* has damned the whole World, for not diſtinguiſhing where no Diſtinction can be made, at leaſt with any certainty. And perhaps this Damning Humour of his, has *juſtly* provoked ſome to write him, not S. *Athanaſius*, but (drawing the *S.* a little nearer) *Sathanaſius.*

" So there is one Father, not Three Fa-
" thers; one Son, not three Sons; one
" Holy Ghoſt, not three Holy Ghoſts.

In conſiſtence with what goes before, He ſhould have ſaid, Two Fathers; Two Sons; and Three Holy Ghoſts, or Spirits. For the Second Perſon is the Son of the Firſt; and the Third proceeds (which is nothing elſe but *is Generated*) from the Firſt and Second, which makes Two Fathers and Two Sons; and all Three of them are Holy Spirits; for the Father is an Holy Spirit, and ſo is the Son, no leſs than the Third Perſon. But this is not the firſt time in this Creed, that *Athanaſius* has diſcovered *He could not count.*

" In this Trinity, none is Afore or Af-
" ter other; none is Greater, or Leſs than
" another.. Yet

Yet the Son himſelf ſaith, *John* 14. 28. *My Father is Greater than I.* And for the other clauſe, *None is Afore or After other*; 'tis juſt as true as that there is no difference at all between Afore and After. I ask, Whether the Son doth not, *as He is a Son*, derive both Life and Godhead from the Father? All Trinitarians grant, He do's; grounding themſelves on the *Nicene* Creed, which expreſly calls the Son, *God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; Begotten, not Made.* But if the Father gave to the Son Life and Godhead; He muſt have both before he could communicate or give either of them to the Son, and conſequently was afore the Son was. No Effect is ſo early as its Cauſe; for if it were, it ſhould not have needed, or had that for its Cauſe. No Propoſition in *Euclid* is more certain or evident than this.

" The right Faith is, That we believe " and confeſs, that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, " the Son of God, is both God and Man.

Then the Lord Chriſt is *two Perſons*. For as He is God, He is the ſecond Perſon of the (pretended) Trinity; and as He is Man (*a perfect Man*, as this Creed afterwards ſpeaks) He is alſo a Perſon; for a Rational Soul, vitally united to an Human Body, is a Perſon, if there be any ſuch thing as Perſon upon Earth; nay, 'tis the only thing upon Earth that is a Perſon. Let the *Athanaſians* therefore either ſay, that the Lord Chriſt is *Two Perſons*; which is the Hereſie of *Neſtorius*, condemned in a General Council; Or, that He is *not a Man*, contrary to 1 *Tim.* 2. 5. *There is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Jeſus Chriſt*; Or, that He is *not God*, which is the Truth.

" Who, altho' He be God and Man; yet " He is not two, but one Chriſt. One, " not by converſion of the Godhead into " Fleſh, but by taking of the Manhood " into God; One, not by Confuſion of " Subſtance, but by Unity of Perſon.

But becauſe theſe words, *One by taking of the Manhood into God, not by converſion of the Godhead into Fleſh*; And again, *One, not by Confuſion of Subſtance, but Unity of Perſon*; cannot readily be underſtood by themſelves: the Creed-Maker explains them in this following Article; *For as the reaſonable Soul and Fleſh is one Man; ſo God and Man is one Chriſt*; That is, as a Soul united vitally to a Body, maketh one Perſon, called Man, without confounding the two Subſtances of the Soul and body; for the Soul remains what it was, and ſo alſo does the Body; So God the Son being united to a reaſonable Soul and Body, doth, *together with them*, make one Perſon, called Chriſt, without confounding the Subſtances of the Divinity or Humanity; for the Divinity remains, without the leaſt Change, what it was, and ſo doth the Humanity, or reaſonable Soul and Body. This is the only Offer at Senſe that is to be found in this whole Creed; but ſo far from explicating, that it farther perplexes the Difficulty of the (pretended) Incarnations; as will appear by thoſe two Conſiderations.

1. In the *Perſonal Union* of a Soul with a Body, the Union is between two finite things; but in the (pretended) *Perſonal Union* of God to Man and Man to God, the Union is between Finite and Infinite; which (on the Principles of the Trinitarians) is impoſſible. For we muſt either ſuppoſe, that Finite and Infinite are Commenſurate, that is, equal; which every one knows is falſe; or that the Finite is united but to ſome part of the Infinite, and *is disjoyned from the reſt*; which all Trinitarians deny and abhor.

You will ſay, If they admit neither of theſe, how do they ſhew the Poſſibility of the Incarnation, or Union of God to Man? They tell you, God indeed is Infinite, and every reaſonable Soul and Body (even that of Chriſt) is Finite; yet the whole God and whole Man are united; becauſe, *As the whole Eternity of God doth coexiſt to a moment of Time; ſo the whole Immenſity of God is in every Mathematical Point of Space.* The very Truth is, they cannot otherways defend the Incarnation, or *Perſonal Union* of an infinite God to a finite Man; but withal it muſt be owned, that then the Doctrins of the Trinity and Incarnation do infer, imply, and ſuppoſe all the Contradictions that Mr. *Johnſon* has objected to the Doctrin

trin of Transubstantiation, in that little Golden Tract, so deservedly esteemed by All. His whole Book, and all his Demonstrations are founded on these two *Suppositions*, that *a longer time doth not all of it coexist to a shorter*; nor is *a greater Extension constipated or contained in a less*, much less in a Mathematical Point. Therefore all his Books, and all that he hath so well said and argued in the Preface concerning the Authority and Judicature of Reason in Matters of Religion, equally and effectually destroys the Doctrins of the Trinity and Transubstantiation. If the Reader would have an excellent Book, let him procure that. But Oh! were the Press as free for the Unitarians as 'tis for other Protestants; how easily would they make it appear, that the Follies and Contradictions so justly charged on the Transubstantiation, are neither for Number, Consequence, nor Clearness any way comparable, to those implied in the *Athanasian* Creed, and that the Trinity hath the same (and no other) Foundation with the Transubstantiation, so that we must of necessity admit both or neither? If *the Church* is to interpret Scripture for us, we must admit both; but if *Reason*, we can admit neither, and this (I think) the Trinitarians will not deny.

But secondly, In the (pretended) Incarnation or Union of God with Man, the Union cannot be Personal, as 'tis between the Soul and Body; it cannot I mean, be such an Union as to make but one Person. The Union of the Soul and Body may be properly Personal, that is, may constitute or make one Person; because 'tis not the Union of two Persons, but only of one Person (the Soul) to a thing otherways without Life, Reason, Memory, or Free-will. The Body is but as it were the Garment of the Soul, and is wholly acted by it, and depending on it. But in the (pretended) Union of God with a Man, there are two distinct and very different Lives, Memories, Reasons, and Free-Wills; which utterly destroys a Personal Union; for that supposes but one Life, one Reason, one Memory, one Free-Will; for if these things which constitute a Person, are found more than once, there is no longer one Person but two, and consequently no Personal Union in the sense of which we are speaking.

"This is the Catholick Faith, which "except a Man believe faithfully, he cannot "be saved.

By believing, *Athanasius* doth not mean bare believing, but he includeth also therein *Profession*; for, He saith, a little before, *The right Faith is, that we Believe and Confess*, &c. So that a Man cannot be saved, unless he Believes and Professes as this Creed directs him.

First, for *Believing*. *What if a Man cannot believe it?* Are we obliged, under the Penalty of the loss of Salvation, to believe it, whether we can or no? Doth God require of any Man an *impossible Condition*, in order to Salvation?

Secondly, As to professing under pain of Damnation. *What if it be against a Man's Conscience to profess it?* The Scripture saith, *Whatsoever is not of Faith, is Sin*; if therefore a Man profess against his Conscience, He sins; and if notwithstanding this, a Man must either Profess, or be Damned, then God requires *some Men* to sin in order to their Salvation: but this we are sure is false, and therefore that the Menace in the Article is vain.

And now I appeal to all Men, that have any freedom of Judgment remaining; Whether this Creed is fit to be retained in any Christian, much less Protestant and reformed Church? Since it subverts the Foundations, not only of Christianity, but of all Religion, that is to say, Reason and Revelation; there being no Principle in Reason and Scripture more evident, than that *God is One*; or that there is one Almighty, only-Wise and Good Person, or Father of all. If we cannot be sure of this, then Religion and Christianity are built upon Fancy only, and have no solid Foundation.

This Creed may be profess'd by the Roman Political Church; because it gives countenance to their Absurd Transubstantiation, and Cunning Traditions added to Scrip-

Scripture; as those Doctrins do to the gaining of Veneration, and consequently Dominion and Riches to their Clergy; But in a reformed Church, where the Scripture is held to be *a Compleat Rule* of Faith and Manners, and also to be *Clear and Plain* in all things necessary to Salvation, even to the meanest Understanding, that reads it or hears it with Sobriety and Attention; such a Confession of Faith is (I think) intolerable, as being utterly inconsistent with those Principles, and reducing us back to the Roman Bondage.

Besides, Nothing has been or is more scandalous to Jews and Mahometans, than his Creed, the chief Article of whose Religion is, that there is *one only God*. The evidence of which Principle is such in nature as well as Scripture, that it has propagated Mahomatism among greater Numbers, than at this day own Christianity; for the sake of that one Truth, so many Nations have swallowed all the Errors and Follies of the *Alchoran*, or Book of *Mahomet*; as on the other Hand, Christianity has been rejected and detested among them, on the account of the Christians *Three Persons, who are severally and each of them God*.

But the Mischiefs of this Creed do not stay here, it is levelled not only against the True Faith, but is destructive of that Love and Charity, Which is the Spirit and Life of Christianity; and without which, Faith is but a Life-less Body. For as if it would effectually inspire all its Believers, with a Spirit of Judging, Damning, and Uncharitableness; it pronounces the Sentence of Eternal Damnation, in the Beginning, Middle and Conclusion, upon all that do not both Believe and Profess this Faith, and keep it whole and undefiled; that is, upon the whole Greek Church, and other Churches in the East; and upon at least Five Parts of Six of all that profess Christianity in the World, whose Understanding cannot possibly reach to the Sense and Coherence, which some pretend to find in this Creed.

Thus the Christian Religion is destroyed, in both the Essential Parts of it, Faith and Love. Hence have proceeded many and endless Controversies, bitter Animosities, cruel Persecutions, Wars among Christians; and at length the more Fierce and Violent, the more Deceitful and Sophistical Parts, have attained their Tyrannical Domination over their Opposers; and have Introduced and setled, a Christianity shall I call it, or, *a Superstition*, or *a Polity*, quite contrary to the Doctrin and Practice of our Blessed Lord, and of his Apostles?

An Answer to an Anonimous Pampleteer, &c.

A Paper fell lately into my hands, which upon perusual, I found to be and Invective against the Person of St. *Athanasius*, and the Author of it a professed Enemy to those Mysteries contain'd in his Creed, which he impugns; and fearing left this should prove a stumbling-block to some of the Illiterate Vulgar, to see the chief Mysteries of Christianity, to be so openly attack'd by one who denies the Trinity, the Incarnation of the Divine Word, and the Divinity of Christ; and yet asserts the Scriptures, the Old and New Testament, to be the Word of God: I resolved to answer the Arguments of this Deist, which I here undertake.

And

And becauſe this Author hath involved himſelf in obſcurity and confuſion, I ſhall endeavour by ſome previous Obſervations, to clear the way to this Diſcourſe in a Matter ſo difficult and nice, and ſo remote from Senſe; by this means not to confound the Reader, but to render the Diſcourſe ſo clear and conſpicuous, as the Nature of theſe Sublime Myſteries are capable of; where I ſhall wave thoſe Indignities and Aſperſions which this Author caſts upon the Perſon of St. *Athanaſius*, leaving this to the Learned Hiſtorians, and confine my ſelf wholly to the Scope of ſuch Dogmatical Principles as he endeavours to ſubvert.

1 *Obſervation.* My firſt Obſervation is the nature of the Myſtery of the Sacred Trinity, wherein all Orthodox Chriſtians hold as an *Article of Faith*, one only God, and Three Divine Perſons, (*viz.*) the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, by a real Identity between the Divine Nature, and the Perſonality of theſe Three Perſons, ſo that the Divinity or God-head is ſingular, and indiviſible; but the Perſonalities are really diſtinct from each other, and yet really identified with the Divine Eſſence, ſo that all together make *unum ſummum Ens*, as the Council of *Lateran* terms it.

2 *Obſervation.* A ſecond Obſervation is, that there are three manners of ſpeaking in this Sacred Myſtery, which ought ſtrictly to be obſerv'd.

I. Some expreſſions are abſolute, as the *God-head*, the *Divine Eſſence*, or *Divinity*, with its concomitant Attributes, where no mention is made of the Divine Revelations, nor of number.

II. There is another manner of ſpeaking, by notional terms, as the Divines call them; ſuch are the *Paternity*, the *Filiation*, the *Paſſion*, *Spiration*, all in *abſtracto*, which are always to be underſtood with relation to each other, and conſtitute number.

III. A third way of ſpeaking is, when ſuch words are uſed as ſignifie the Divine Nature contracted with the Perſonalities, or notional Predicates, as *the Father, the Son, the Holy Ghoſt*, where Relations and Number are to be admitted.

3 *Obſervation.* A third Obſervation is drawn from the two former, That all the abſolute Perfections which are in the *Father*, are alſo in the *Son*, and in the *Holy Ghoſt*; not in equality, for where there is equality, there is alſo a relation between the perfections that are equal; but the ſelf ſame numerical and individual perfections which are abſolute Predicates of the Divinity, are in all and every one of the Perſons, *per communicationem idiomatum*. The reaſon is, becauſe all the three Perſonalities are identifi'd with the Divine Nature, which is the root of all the abſolute Perfections of the Divinity; ſo theſe abſolute Perfections are alſo really identifi'd with all and every one of the Divine Perſons, according to that receiv'd Axiom of the Divines; *Omnia dedit Pater Filio præter eſſe Patrem*, ſo that the Father gave the Son even the fecundity of active Spiration, whatſoever the *Greeks* in vain object againſt it, as I ſhall make it more largely appear in a Treatiſe of the *Trinity*, which I intend ſhortly to put forth. And ſo I proceed to anſwer the ill-grounded allegations of this Deiſt or Atheiſt, againſt the Orthodox Doctrin of the Church.

His firſt attempt is againſt that ſaying of *Athanaſius*, *Neither confounding the Perſons, nor dividing the ſubſtance, for there is one Perſon of the Father, another of the Son, another of the Holy Ghoſt; but the God-head of the Father, and of the Son and Holy Ghoſt is all one.* On theſe words he thus paſſeth his Cenſure: *Plain as if a man ſhould ſay*, Peter, James, *and* John, *being three Perſons, are one Man, and one Man is theſe three diſtinct Perſons*, Peter, James, *and* John. A very Learned Obſervation; he compares three diſtinct human Perſons, having three diſtinct human Natures, with the three Divine Perſons of the Sacred Trinity, where the ſame individual Divine Nature is in all three; this is ſingular, that is, numerical; this is indiviſible, that is diviſible; this can conſtitute no more Gods but one,

that must constitute three distinct men. The Reason is obvious, because the denomination of *God* [being a term absolute] is taken from the Divine Nature, so that if the Divine Nature be singular, the God-head must also be singular. As the denomination of *Man* is taken from the Human Nature, so because the Human Nature is multiplied, the denomination of *Man* must also be multiplied. How obvious is this to any vulgar Capacity? How little Reason had this Author to call this Doctrin of *Athanasius*, and of the Church of God, *a ridiculous attempt, a barbarous indignity, a monstrous proposition*? He might more prudently have wav'd the discovery of his illiterate Genius herein.

Yet he goes on in the same strain of confounding the absolute Perfections of the Divine Essence, with the notional Expressions of the Persons; for on these Words of *Athanasius, Neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the Substance*, he adds, *But how can we not confound the Persons that have but one numerical Substance? And how can we not but divide the Substance, which we find in three distinct divided Persons? There is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, another of the Holy Ghost.* To which he subjoyns, *Then the Son is not the Father, nor is the Father the Son, nor the Holy Ghost either of them.* 'Tis confest. What then? Why says he, *If the Father is not the Son, and yet is the one true God, then the Son is not the one true God, because he is not the Father.* I deny this illation as false and nugatory on this present subject. Now to the proof, *for how can the Son be the one true God, if he is not he who is the one true God?* I answer, *sub distinctione*; if the Son be not he who has the compleat and adequate essential constitution of the one true God, then he cannot be God, I grant it; if the Son be not another Person, namely the Father, and yet hath the compleat and adequate essential constitution of the one true God, he cannot be God. I deny it. The fallacy of the Author consists in this, that he grosly confounds the notional and relative Predicates with the absolute and essential Predicates; for consider the sublime Mystery that we are upon, and what hath been said above in the third Observation upon it, and you will find the Errour; for this Deist insists upon two Persons, the Father, and the Son; and supposing the Father to be the one true God, he infers that therefore the Son, which is a distinct Person, is not the one true God, and yet the same, though a different Person, yet hath all the absolute and essential perfections with the Father; he hath the same numerical Essence, Nature and Divinity with the Father. Now I demand, whether it be possible that he should have the compleat and adequate essential Constitution of the God-head, and yet not be the one true God? For the God-head is singular, wherein a number is Chimerical; you had as good tell me that one may have the adequate Constitution of a Man, which is *animal rationale*, and yet not be a man, which is impossible, for where there is the compleat essence of a thing, there is the thing it self, which is nothing else but its compleat essence.

Then he proceeds: In the Creed *the God-head of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one, the Glory equal, the Majesty co-eternal. Therefore I ask*, says this Author, *whether the Glory and Majesty with which the Son and Spirit are Glorious and Majestical be the same in number with which the Father is Glorious and Majestical?* I answer Affirmatively. Then it follows, says this Author, *that the Glory and Majesty of these Persons is neither equal nor co-eternal*, which he attempts to prove; because equality and co-eternity import a distinction between the things equal and co-eternal; therefore I distinguish the sense of this Illation, the Glory and Majesty of these Persons, if taken absolutely and essentially, is neither equal nor co-eternal, I grant it; if taken notionally and personally; I deny it. The meaning of this distinction is cleared by the former Observations, for if you take them personally, they constitute number, and ground relations and cor-relations to each other; but if understood essentially and absolutely, they do neither; in plain terms, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, which are

are three distinct Persons, are equally Glorious by the same numerical and individual Glory which is singular and essential to the Divinity. But he replies, That in case the Glory of the three Persons be numerically the same, then so are also all the other Attributes; whence it ensues, that there is no real distinction between the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, but are only three Names of the same thing without any distinction, as the *Sabellians* hold. I am sorry that I have to deal with a Person so meanly vers'd in Divinity, as not to distinguish the Attributes of the Divinity from the notional and relative Predicates; the Attributes are singular, and are all communicated to every one of the Persons, because they are absolute Predicates, but the Relations are peculiar to each Person; so the Father hath communicated to the Son all the Divine Attributes, and what else is peculiar to the Divine Essence, but hath not given him his Paternity, as is noted above, for Paternity is a relative Predicate, peculiar to one Person alone, and not communicable; the same with proportion is to be said of the Filiation, and passive Spiration.

In the next place, says this Prophane Libeller, *This Creed teaches that the Father is Incomprehensible, Uncreated, Eternal, Almighty, the Son is Uncreated, Eternal, Almighty* &c. *Also that each of these Persons by himself is God, and Lord, yet there are not three Gods, nor Lords, nor three Incomprehensibles*, &c.

Now if in imitation of this, a Man should have a mind to say the Father is a Person, the Son is a Person, the Holy Ghost is a Person, yet not three Persons, but one Person; I would know why this were not as good Grammar and Arithmetick, as when Athanasius *says, the Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Ghost is God, yet not three Gods, but one God?*

I answer, that whatever Grammar, or Arithmetick there is in it. I am sure there is no true Divinity in it; for this Deistical Author insists here still upon the same errour, for the word *Person* is a relative and notional expression, whereof there are three in God: but the word *God* is an absolute and essential term, which is singular, and cannot be multiplied, as hath been often reiterated in this Discourse; but he demands, *Doth not a man contradict himself, when the terms of his negation are the same with those in his affirmation?* Now for Logick, I answer, That two contradictory Propositions ought to be *ejusdem de eodem*; that is, *ejusdem prædicati de eodem subjecto*, as, *Angelus est Spiritus: Angelus non est Spiritus. There are three Gods, there are not three Gods; there are three Persons, there are not three Persons*, &c. But where is the least appearance of any Contradiction in all this?

Yet to make this the more conspicuous, I must take each Proposition in pieces, and scan the several parts thereof according to the rates of Logick. For in these three Propositions, *the Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Ghost is God*; the Subject of the first is *the Father*, the Subject of the second is *the Son*, the Subject of the third is *the Holy Ghost*; these three Subjects are three distinct Person, Really different from each other. The Predicate of the first is *God*, this is an absolute and essential Term, not capable of being multiplied, for it is the Deity it self which is singular, and therefore the Predicate of the second Proposition, which is also God, must be the same Deity with the first, not another distinct Deity, for a second *God* would be a meer Chimera: so likewise the Predicate of the third Proposition is also *God*, which still imports the same Deity, this term *God* not being capable of any multiplicity; so that the Subject of these three Propositions are three different Persons Really distinct from each other; the Predicate of the same three Propositions, which is *God*, hath for its Object the singular Essence of the Divine Natur, and the Propositions being all affirmative, do intentionally identifie the Deity with the subject of the same Propositions, which are the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, as they are identifi'd *a parte rei*, wherein consists the verity of the same Propositions.

As concerning the three last Propositions the case is very different; for in the first of them, which is this, *the Father is a Person*, though the Subject be the same as

in the three former Propoſitions, yet the Predicate is very different; for in the firſt of theſe laſt Propoſitions the Predicate is *a Perſon*, a generical term, common to all Perſons; the Predicate of the ſecond is alſo *a Perſon*, but diſtinct from the former in application, as the Myſtery teaches; ſo likewiſe the Predicate of the third is *a Perſon*; but theſe Propoſitions being all affirmative, cannot be verifi'd, but by applying that generical Term *a Perſon* to different and diſtinct *individuums*; for an affirmative Propoſition cannot be true, except there be an Identity between the Subject and the Predicate *ex parte objecti*; now the Filiation is a ſingular individuation, which cannot be identifi'd with any other Perſonality, therefore the Propoſitions import a multiplicity of Perſons, as the three former do import a ſingularity of the Deity. Hence it is apparent, that we cannot ſay, *yet not three Perſons, but one Perſon*, as we ſay, *yet not three Gods, but one God.*

What follows in the Author, is meer ſtuff, and deſerves no further anſwer, for he goes upon a falſe ſuppoſition, which no Orthodox Chriſtian will admit; namely, that there are two ſorts of true Gods, three perſonal Gods, and beſides, one Eſſential God; whereas the Chriſtian Faith never admitted but one true God, who by his Omnipotence Created this Inferiour and Superiour Wold, and by his infinite Prudence and Providence preſerveth and governeth all things; wherefore we deny the ſuppoſition as falſe and Heretical, as will be obvious to any who conſiders what hath been already ſaid in this Treatiſe, eſpecially in the firſt and third Obſervation.

But this great Oracle of the Deiſts goes on upon the ſubſequent paſſages of this Creed, and particularly upon theſe words: *The Son is of the Father alone, not Made, nor Created, but Begotten*; to which he anſwers, *That if the Creed-maker had ſpoke here of the Creation of the Son by Divine Power on the Virgin* Mary, *it would have been true, that the Son is neither Made, nor Created, but Begotten; but then the firſt part of the Article would be falſe, that the Son is of the Father alone; for he that has a Father and a Mother, is of Both. But ſince he ſpeaks of the (pretended) Eternal Generation, the latter part of the Article is falſe, and inconſiſtent with the firſt part of it.*

The meer explanation of the terms *Made*, *Created*, and *Begotten*, will evacuate this difficulty. That which is Made or Created proceeds from the Maker or Creator, as an Effect from its Cauſe, by the mediation of a real action, or cauſalty between the cauſe and the effect; that which is begotten is produced by Generation; but how ſhall we diſtinguiſh Generation from the production of the Effect from its Cauſe? I anſwer, that according to the known definition, admitted and approved of in the Schools of Philoſophers and Divines: Generation is *Origo viventis à vivente, à principio conjuncto, in Similitudinem naturæ.* Now to admit a real Action or Cauſality between the Father and the Son in the Eternal Generation of the Divine Word, were to make a change in the Divine Eſſence, *ad intra*, of that immutable God that can admit of no change. Whence it unavoidably follows, that the Eternal Son of God is neither Made, nor Created; but how how then can we make it appear that he is Begotten? I anſwer, becauſe he is produced by Generation, according to the definition given; for he is produced by the Divine Underſtanding, as related to all Creatures poſſible, by a clear and conſpicuous repreſentation, but eſpecially a lively Image of all the Perfections of the Divinity, which makes him to be *in ſimilitudinem naturæ*, as I ſhall more largely explicate and prove in the *Treatiſe of the Trinity*, which I intend ſhortly to bring to light. But to talk of a *Mother* (as this Author doth) is an impertinent indignity offer'd to the Divine Word, and ſavours too much of the mean thoughts of the ignorant Vulgar.

Next in the *Athanaſian* Creed follows, that *the Holy Ghoſt is of the Father, and of the Son, neither Made, nor Created, nor Begotten, but Proceeding.* Here this Deiſt Cavils firſt with the Holy Ghoſt's proceeding from the Son, contrary to the Tenet of the *Greek* Church, for which he cites that Text of Scripture, *John* 15. 26. *When the Comforter is*

is come, which I will ſend unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he ſhall teſtifie of me. Doth this Text prove that the Holy Ghoſt doth notproceed from the Son? it only aſſerts that the Holy Ghoſt proceeds from the Father, which we all grant, but whether or no it proceedeth alſo from the Son, it doth not determine; but I ſhall prove this at large in my *Treatiſe of the Trinity.*

Secondly, he ſays (ſubjoyns this Author) *that the Holy Ghoſt is not begotten, but proceeding*; yet he alledgeth that it is confeſſed by the moſt Learned Trinitarians, that *Begotten* and *Proceeding* differ nothing at all; But I would fain know who thoſe Learned Trinitarians are; for it is well known that the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity, therefore is Begotten, becauſe he is produced by the Underſtanding, which repreſents the Deity, and the Creatures poſſible, ſo that by the internal vertue of his production, he is intended to be *in ſimilitudinem* [whence he is called the Divine Word] *naturæ*, whereas the Holy Ghoſt proceeds by the Will, which is no repreſentative Power, but be proceeds by an act of Love of the ſame Divinity; who doth not ſee that theſe two are far different from each other? and this clearly ſolves that frivolous Diſcourſe which follows; that in counting right we ſhould ſay two Father, two Sons, and three Holy Ghoſts, or Spirits; for which ſaying there is no ground at all, as appears by the difference given between *Begotten*, and *Proceeding*.

Next in the Creed follows, *None is afore, or after other; none greater, or leſs than another.*

Yet the Son himſelf ſaith, John 14. 28. *the Father is greater than I.* I anſwer, That the *Son* ſays not this of his Divinity, but being Hypoſtatically united to fleſh, he ſpoke it when he was in fleſh of his Humanity; *none is afore or after other.* I ask, ſays this Deiſt, *whether the Son doth not, as he is a Son, derive both Life and God-head from the Father?* I anſwer affirmatively. But, ſays he; *if the Father gave to the Son Life and Godhead, he muſt have both before he could communicate or give either of them to the Son.* I anſwer, All this argues only *prioritatem originis*, for as much as the Father was the Origine of all that is in the Son, but all was done from Eternity; ſo there could be no *prioritas temporis*, for before Eternity there was no time; neither could there be any *prioritas naturæ*, ſuch as there is in a Cauſe in reſpect of its Effect, ſince the Father was not the Cauſe, and the Son the Effect, for all Cauſes produce their Effects by the Mediation of an Action, whereof the Cauſe is the Origine, and the Effect is the term, which receives the action, and ſubjects it in it ſelf, as the Philoſophers teach: Now the Eternal Son of God was produced by an act of the Divine Underſtanding, which doth not operate by acts diſtinct from it ſelf, as Men and Angels do; but all acts of the Divine Intellect and Will have a real identity with the Divine Nature and Eſſence of God, as the Divines teach; for elſe if God ſhould underſtand by diſtinct acts, thoſe acts muſt inform the Divine Underſtanding, which would make a change in God, and ſo deſtroy his Immutability, as is apparent. The ſame with proportion is to be ſaid of the Holy Ghoſt, who proceeds by an act of Love from the Divine Will, no leſs than that act of the Divine Intellect produces the Divine Word, or its Hypoſtaſis.

With what reaſon, now, can this Author ſtill go on in his wilful ignorance? He often ſaith that this Creed contains many Contradictions, and as many Impoſſibilities as Tranſubſtantiation, and yet in all his Diſcourſe, he hath not alledged two Propoſitions with a contradictory oppoſition which follows out of the Doctrin of this Creed; nay, I confidently aſſert, that neither he, nor any of his Sect, can alledge any one contradiction iſſuing from the ſame Doctrin. Let the pretended contradiction be aſſigned, and we are ready to anſwer it, and to diſcover its fallacy; but to blunder and vaper as this Author does, that there are Two Fathers, Two Sons, and Three Holy Ghoſts, and yet prove nothing of all this, is not to proceed like a Scholar, much leſs like a Divine, but is wholly loſs of time.

How

How often muſt I inculcate this Orthodox Truth? That in the ineffable Miſtery of the Divine Trinity, the characteriſtical notion of the Father is his innaſcibility, together with his paternity and fecundity of active ſpiration; of the Son is his filiation and fecundity of active ſpiration; of the Holy Ghoſt, is his paſſive Spiration alone; Theſe Three Perſons, as they mutually are correlatives to each other, ſo they are really diſtinct from each other; they are capable of Multiplication, and conſtitute a number. The Father hath in himſelf (beſides the relative Predicates) all the abſolute Predicates and Perfections that are contained in the Divine Nature and Eſſence, all the Attributes of the Divinity. The Father hath Communicated to the Son all the abſolute Perfections of the Divine Nature, and the notional Predicate of active Spiration. To the Holy Ghoſt, the Father and the Son have communicated all the Divinity, with all the abſolute Attributes and Perfections thereunto belonging.

So that although theſe three Perſons are three in number, yet the Divinity of them all is the ſelf-ſame individual and ſingular Deity; for the ſame Divine Nature that is in the Father, is alſo in the Son, and Holy Ghoſt. Now this Author would have us to multiply the Divinity as the Perſons are multiplied, thereby to lead his Reader into a Labyrinth of Errors, by acknowledging more Gods than one; which in effect is no better than rank Paganiſm. Muſt we follow the conduct of his wild Genius, becauſe he pretends to Demonſtrations, which in effect are meer Improbabilities; or adhere to thoſe Sacred Truths which are delivered to us by holy Writ, and are backt by Divine Authority? But let us proceed with him to the Incarnation of the Divine Word.

The *Athanaſian* Creed from hence proceeds to the Incarnation of the Divine Word; thus, *The right Faith is, that we believe and confeſs, that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt the Son of God is both God and Man.* To which words this Author replies, *That then the Lord Chriſt is two Perſons, for as he is God, he is the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity; and as he is man (a perfect man) he is alſo a Perſon, for a Rational Soul vitally united to a Humane Body, is a Perſon.* I anſwer, that a Rational Soul vitally united to a Humane Body is the compleat Nature of a Man, compleat I ſay, *ratione naturæ*, but to be compleat alſo *ratione Perſonæ*, you muſt add to this compleat Nature a *ſubſiſtentia*, which makes up the compleat Suppoſitum, or Hypoſtaſis of a man *ratione perſonæ*.

But in Chriſt there was no need of this Humane *ſubſiſtentia*, for the Divine Word aſſumed the compleat Humane Nature, not the Human Perſon, as *Neſtorius* ſaid; for the Humanity of Chriſt ſubſiſts by the Perſonality of the Divine Word, which ſupplies abundantly all defects, and functions which the Humane Perſonality would exerciſe, were it preſent; ſo that the Humane Perſonality would be ſuperfluous in Chriſt, and of no uſe at all.

To what he adds, [*viz.*] *Let the Athanaſians then Confeſs that Chriſt was not God, which is the truth.* Here he plainly profeſſeth his Error, and flatly denies the Divinity of Chriſt. It is not my deſign to prove at large in this ſhort Treatiſe, the Divinity of Chriſt, which the Divines have effectually prov'd in the matter of Incarnation. I ſhall therefore only hint at ſome Particulars: As the fulfilling of the Prophecies of the Old Prophets, the Teſtimony of the Eternal Father in a Voice from Heaven: *This is my Beloved Son, in whom I am well pleaſed*; the often aſſeveration of Chriſt himſelf, confirmed by many ſtrange and prodigious Miracles, and ſealed by his Death, the Reluctancy of Nature at his Crucifixion, his Reſurrection after Death, which none could effect but by the mighty hand of the Omnipotent; the Univerſal atteſtation of all the Apoſtles, in Confirmation whereof they all ſacrificed their Lives, with other pregnant motives contained in the Sacred Word of God, which are too prolix for this ſhort Treatiſe; all which being duly prondered and conſidered, are able to convince, not only an indifferent judgment, but alſo the moſt obſtinate and perverſeſt judgment that can be, if it be

be swayed by Reason, and work them into a stedfast belief of the Divinity of Christ; wherefore I shall wave (in this place) any further dilatation of my Discourse upon this Subject.

Now we proceed to examine the Hypostatical Union between the Divinity and Humanity of Christ, how we can make it out, that any Union can be of that Nature as to unite two Natures, whereof the one is Infinite, and the other Finite? for the *Athanasian* Creed asserts, that though *Christ be God and Man, yet he is not two, but one Christ; one, not by Conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking the Mankood into God; one, not by confusion of substance, but by Unity of Person; for as the reasonable Soul and flesh is one Man, so God and Man is one Christ.* Against this the Deist argues, that *in the Personal Union of God to Man, and Man to God, the Union is between Finite and Infinite, which is impossible. For we must either suppose that Finite and Infinite are commensurate, that is, equal, which every one knows is false; or that the Finite is United but to some part of the Infinite, and is disjoyned from the rest.* A very Learned Reflection! For who is ignorant of Gods Eternity, and Immensity, or Ubiquity? Which are two of the Divine Attributes. All Created Durations flow successively by parts, whereof none are at any time in being, but only those that are present; for to day, yesterday is past, its duration is destroyed, and to morrow is not yet come, its duration is not yet produced; and so of all Created Durations; whether this be done only by indivisible instances, as *Zeno* Taught, or by indivisible instances, and divisible parts, which was *Aristotle*'s Opinion in his Treatise *De continuo Successivo.*

But God's Eternity is far different; for this admits of no parts, but is one indivisible duration, essentially determin'd to co-exist to all Created duration, and Eternity; there are no parts destroyed, and others to come, not yet in being; for by the same indivisible duration whereby the Divinity existed from Eternity, he exists now, and existed yesterday, and shall exist to morrow, and ever, and yet loses no parts of its duration, because it hath none. Hence *Boetius*, and with him the current of Divines, gives this definition of it, *Æternitas Dei est Indeterminabilis vitæ, tota simul & perfecta possessio*; a perfect possession of an endless life, altogether, *tota simul*, not by parts, as it is in all Created durations.

The Immensity of God Consists in this, that he is essentially determin'd to all Created space, whensoever or wheresoever it exists; so that God by his Immensity, without any parts, is actually present to all Created space or place, how distant soever the parts of space are from one another; to which God corresponds not by several parts, but by an increate definitive ubication, whereby he is *totus in toto, & totus in qualibet parte*; all the Deity is in all the space, and all the Deity is in every part and particle of space, wheresoever, or whensoever existent; as an Angel, which is indivisible, is in the place which he Occupies by a definitive ubication; for the whole Angel is at the same time in all the space, and the whole Angel at the same time is in every part and particle of the same space; so is the Soul of Man, which is likewise indivisible, in a humane Body; for the whole Soul is in all the Body, and the whole Soul is in every part and particle of the Body; so that the Soul exists in the Body by a definitive ubication, whereas the Body at the same time exists in space by a circumscriptive ubication, whereby its parts are collocated so, as that one part of the Body corresponds to one part of the space, and another part of the Body to another part of the space. Now to the Objection.

The Humanity of Christ is constituted in place by a circumscriptive ubication, where the Divinity, the whole Divine Word is intimately present to him; what commensuration more than this is necessary for a conjunction between the Humanity, and the Divine Word? For that the Divine Word is in all places else, by his immensity, is impertinent to this case, as long as the Divine Word is intirely and intimately present to the whole Humanity, where the Hypostatical Union may exercise its functions

ons of connecting the Humanity to the Divinity; for it is too groſs an imagination of the Divinity, that part of it ſhould correſpond to the Humanity, and part not; for in the Divine Nature there are no parts, but all is indiviſible.

Now for the Hypoſtatical Union, it is ſubjected in the Humanity, and terminated to the Divinity, or Divine Word; for the Eſſence of God is uncapable of receiving any thing diſtinct from it ſelf. And 'tis in vain to tell me that this includes as many Contradictions as Mr. *Johnſon*'s Treatiſe againſt Tranſubſtantiation doth. Produce theſe Contradictions that this Myſtery doth include, and we ſhall uſe our endeavour to ſolve them.

The ſecond Objection is grounded upon an Error, that the Union between the Divine Word, and the Humanity of Chriſt connects two Perſons, as *Neſtorius* would have it; but this error is already exploded. But it is in vain to ſift all the extent of Nature, for a parity to the Hypoſtatical Union of the Divine Word to the Humanity of Chriſt, which is tranſcendent above all the power of Nature, where the two diſtinct Lives, Memories, Reaſons and free Wills are no obſtacle at all to it; for theſe two Natures do not hinder the Operations and Functions of each other.

Thus I have run through all the Arguments, pretended Contradictions, and Impoſſibilities, which this Author alledgeth againſt thoſe Sacred Myſteries of Chriſtianity; wherein I have endeavoured to give a ſatisfactory ſolution to them all. Tho' he hath inſiſted upon ſuch Myſteries as are eaſieſt to be impugned, and hardeſt to be defended. For they are ſuch as are delivered to us by the Sacred Scripture, as back'd by Divine Authority, and are not within the reach of Natural Reaſon to demonſtrate. For it were no leſs than a temerarious preſumption in any man that ſhould attempt to prove any one of theſe Myſteries by Natural Reaſon; Myſteries that are ſo ſublime, and elevated above the reach of Natural Reaſon, that they are not pervious to the Wit or Capacity either of Man or Angel; which if Faith did not teach, Reaſon could not explicate; ſo that we receive them from Holy Writ (as atteſted by Divine Authority) with great ſubmiſſion and veneration, and are ready to vindicate them from all pretended impoſſibilities, Contradictions, and other Difficulties which the *Mahometans*, *Jews*, *Deiſts*, *Atheiſts*, or other Infidels can muſter up againſt them. And I hope in this ſhort Treatiſe I have not ſwerved from the receiv'd and approved Doctrin of the Reformed Proteſtant Church of *England*, to whoſe Authority and Correction I ſubmit.

FINIS.